	Case 5:09-cv-03049-RMW	Document 18	Filed 09/14/09	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3			*E EII 1	ED 0/14/00*
5			<u> </u>	ED - 9/14/09*
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	IN RE: CONOCOPHILLIPS CO	MPANY	Case No. MDL-0)9-02040-RMW
12	SERVICE STATION RENT COLLITIGATION			
13				
14	DALIWINDED GINGH		G N G 00 0	2040 IE
15 16	BALWINDER SINGH, Plaintiff,		Case No. C-09-0	3049-JF
17	V.			
18	CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY	7.		
19	Defendant.	,		
20				
21	GREGORY GALATOLO		Case No. C-09-0	
22	Plaintiff,		WITHOUT PR	ING RELATION EJUDICE
23	v. CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY	7		
24	Defendant.	,		
25	2 oronaun.			
26				
27				

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Defendant ConocoPhillips has filed notices that cases Singh v. ConocoPhillips Company (C-09-03409 JF) and Galatolo v. ConocoPhillips Company (C-09-03570 JF) should be related to the multi-district litigation In Re: ConocoPhillips Co. Service Station Rent Contract Litigation (MDL-09-02040 RMW) assigned to this court. Defendant asserts that Singh and Galatolo involve allegations that defendant has failed to comply with the California Franchise Investment Law by, among other things, not disclosing rent increases, debit and credit card processing fees and defendant's intent to sell the plaintiffs' service stations and that those allegations are essentially identical to the allegations made in *In Re: ConocoPhillips Company Rent Contract Litigation*. Plaintiffs oppose relation and contend that defendant failed to mention fact that each of the MDL cases alleges federal jurisdiction arising out ConocoPhillips' violation of the Petroleum Marketing Practices Act ("PMPA"), 15 U.S.C. Section 2805, which explicitly confers jurisdiction on the United States Courts, regardless of the amount in controversy, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §1331. Plaintiffs say that neither *Singh* nor *Galatolo* alleges or raises any claims for violation of the PMPA. Rather, all of the claims raised are based solely on California law and each plaintiff specifically seeks damages of less than \$75,000. Since the cases were brought into federal court by notices of removal filed by defendant, plaintiffs intend to seek remand to state court.

The court finds that relation of the *Singh* and *Galatolo* should be determined after plaintiffs' remand motions are determined. Therefore, the motion to relate *Singh* and *Galatolo* to *In Re:*ConocoPhillips Co. Service Station Rent Contract Litigation is denied without prejudice. If the motions to remand are denied, defendant may renew its request that the cases be related.

23

DATED: <u>9/11/09</u>

25

24

26

27

28

RONALD M. WHYTE United States District Judge

mala m. Whyte